APPROVALS BOARD - CLARIFICATION RESPONSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To note, this is an extract from a larger document which reproduces all Hacker House material and omits any information relating only to other bids.

POLICY RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING:

Based on clarification question responses, the following initiatives are recommended for funding:
- **[CSIIF Applicant]** - full funding
- **[CSIIF Applicant]**- full funding
- **[CSIIF Applicant]** - partial funding and WMCA allocation

Based on clarification question responses, the following initiatives are not recommended for funding
- **Hacker House Ltd** - given extended timeline for delivery with reduced funding (20 months total project)
- **[CSIIF Applicant]** - given limited funding available

  * However, if the Board wishes to consider funding for both of these initiatives, the financial implications have been set out in amber on the table below.

Based on clarification question responses, the following initiative is not recommended for funding at this time, but for further funding to be considered at a later date pending outcomes of their pilot initiative.
- **[CSIIF Applicant]** - given delay to existing pilot initiative and limited outcomes achieved to date.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

	FY18/19 (£[redacted figures])	FY19/20 (£[redacted figures])	Total sum (£[redacted figures])
[CSIIF Applicant]	-	-	-
[CSIIF Applicant]	-	-	-
[CSIIF Applicant]	-	-	-
[CSIIF Applicant]	-	-	-
	-	-	-
Hacker House Ltd	20,000	80,000	100,000
	[cumulative total]	[cumulative total]	[cumulative total]
OR			
[CSIIF Applicant]	-	-	-
	-	-	-

GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY OF CSIIF PILOT AND EXPANDED FUND BIDS (APPROVED AND SHORTLISTED):

[Diagram removed]

NUMBERS OF RETRAINED CANDIDATES PER INITIATIVE

	Retrained candidates
[CSIIF Applicant]	-
[CSIIF Applicant]	-
[CSIIF Applicant]	-
[CSIIF Applicant]	-
	-
Hacker House Ltd	50
	[cumulative total]
OR	
[CSIIF Applicant]	-
	-

CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS: RESPONSE SUMMARY

1. <u>Hacker House Ltd: Hands on Hacking, Training and Employer Platform</u>

Board feedback:
The Approvals Board raised concerns and requested clarifications on:
   i. What type of roles would candidates be delivered into;
   ii. How many individuals have Hacker House Ltd identified, trained and placed into cyber security roles to date;
   iii. How many employers have expressed an interest in, or commitment to, placing candidates from Hacker House;
   iv. How Hacker House proposes to become a sustainable initiative at the conclusion of government funding given the lack of match funding;
   v. Whether Hacker House Ltd would be able to deliver a project at decreased funding and how would their milestones be adjusted accordingly.

Summarised applicant clarification:
   i. Candidates would be delivered into junior penetration tester roles.
   ii. Between ▮▮▮▮▮ students have been placed into roles through their completion of the Hacker House course.
   iii. Between ▮▮▮ employers actively use Hacker House Ltd to train their new recruits.
   iv. If funding is received, more resource would be allocated to the development of the portal, which would increase the amount of candidates and services provided and ultimately lead to more engagement with industry to place candidates and become sustainable without government funding.
   v. Yes, Hacker House are willing to deliver at reduced funding, but this will add an additional 10-12 months to timelines of getting at least 50 candidates into cyber security employment.